

Application/Control Number : 09/775,492
Art Unit: 2634
September 24, 2004
Page 5

Remarks

It is observed that the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 as containing subject-matter which was not described in the specification.

In particular, the Examiner said that:

- a) it is not clear how the components connected as described in the specification and figures 2-3 results in the complex signal converted from the real signal;
- b) the function of the first adder is not clear;
- c) the operation of the selector is not clear;
- d) the function of the multipliers is not clear.

It is submitted the following:

- the first adder 6 is an adder which performs a sum operation between the input signal 1 and the output of the oscillator 7.
- The selector 10 is a device which sends signal 9 to the output when ...
- The multipliers 14 and 15 perform a multiply operation between the output of the threshold circuits 12 and 13 and the output of the oscillator 16.
- The term mixer used by the Examiner is a term generally used in radio frequency to perform the multiplication function, but, while all multipliers are mixers, not all mixers are multipliers. As the applicant's claimed method can be implemented in digital or analog domain, it is better using the term "multiplier".
- The selector 10 is a selector that operates at twice the band-center frequency of the signal to be converted. The passage on page 3, lines 19-25 of the specification must be read in this way: in order to better clarify this, the applicant has inserted a "comma" after ".branch I)" at line 24.

In other words, the selector operates always at the same frequency: what is different for the branches I and Q is the period for which the signal is sent to the branches I and Q.

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in an allowable condition.

Application/Control Number : 09/775,492

Art Unit: 2634

September 24, 2004

Page 6

Thus, allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

It will be noted that a sincere effort has been made to positively respond to all of the points raised by the Examiner.

While it is believed that the amended claims properly define the present invention, applicant would be open to any suggestion the Examiner may have concerning different claim phraseology which, in the Examiner's opinion, more accurately defines the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,



Guido MODIANO (Reg. No. 19,928)

Agent for the Applicant

Date: September 22, 2004
Address: Via Meravigli 16, 20123 MILAN-ITALY
Telephone: (from USA) (011)(39)(02)8590-7777
Telefax: (from USA)(011)(39)(02)863-860

Encl.: -Three Replacement Drawing Sheets.